

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

FILED 09 SEP 29 16:49 USDC ORP

RICHARD NORLAND,

Plaintiff,

No. CV 05-6312-ST

v.

OPINION AND ORDER

STATE OF OREGON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

MOSMAN, J.,

On June 25, 2009, Magistrate Judge Stewart issued Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (#107) in the above-captioned case recommending that Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (#93) be DENIED, that Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Response and Request for Sanctions (#99) be DENIED, and that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#83) be GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. Plaintiff filed objections to the F&R (#112).

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the

court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Stewart's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R (#107) as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 29 day of September, 2008.


MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Court